

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/544,054	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YONA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher E. Lee	<b>Art Unit</b> 2112	

**All Participants:**

- (1) Christopher E. Lee (USPTO)  
 (2) Joseph B. Ryan (Reg. No. 37,922)

**Status of Application:** Decision on Appeal

- (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 8 June 2005
**Time:** 9:30am (est)
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*Claims 23-29*
**Claims discussed:**
*exemplary claim 23*
**Prior art documents discussed:**
*LaBerge [US 5,771,358]*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Christopher E. Lee  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner explained the Decision on Appeal mailed on 11th of February 2005. In particular, the claims 23-29 rejections are not sustained by the BPAI, but they might be obviously suggested by Laberge reference of the prior art in the record based on the Decision on Appeal. Therefore, the Examiner suggested the cancellation of the claims 23-29 in order to shorten the prosecution time. The Applicants' representative Joseph B. Ryan (Reg. No. 37,922) didn't agree with the suggestion of the cancellation of the claim 23-29 because the Decision on Appeal does not fully describe a potential patentability in the group of the claims 23-29. Thus, the Applicants' representative doesn't want to cancel the claims 23-29. However, the Applicants' representative agreed upon the cancellation of the claims 1-11, 13-22, and 31-38 among the appealed claims according to the Decision on Appeal.